

MassNAHRO presentation of description of two (2) approaches to reorganization, Mandatory Public Housing Management System and Central Service Group. Both approaches assume that additional resources will be necessary to build out the capacity that is contemplated.

|   | Description   | Governance  | Admin and Staffing Funds  | Benefits/Outcomes   | Challenges/Limitations  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Mandatory Public Housing Management System</b>   | Form a single, consolidated housing authority property management system consisting of local site staff, regional supervision and technical assistance and centralized back-office functions. Participation in the system would be mandatory for all small and medium LHAs with state-only hard units and Sec. 8 (170 LHAs) and optional for all other housing authorities. Housing authorities that have persistent operating problems and low performance measures could also be required to utilize this system. | Maintain local boards to function in an ownership and development capacity and link local boards to the governance of the operating system.   | Majority of existing funds shift to public housing management system to cover site office, site managers and site maintenance/custodial staff. Small portion of funds remain with LHA to cover asset manager. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Operations</li><li>• Invests in highly trained central and regional staff</li><li>• Improves local services by local staff on site-based activities and expanding access to professional supports</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Operations</li><li>• More complicated and costly transition due to current staff contracts that must be transitioned.</li><li>• Some local administration functions &amp; staff (e.g., bookkeeping) shift to central office</li></ul> |
|   |   | From a single governance structure to oversee the property management system that is accountable to Governor, legislature, housing authorities and residents. The sub-committee considered a large governance structure with all 170 LHAs meeting twice each year and electing a governing board of 11 to 13 that would meet monthly. Upon further consideration, DHCD recommends consideration of a simpler approach with a board of 13, 5 of which are LHA members elected on a regional basis, 4 of which are appointed by the Governor and would need to have extensive housing experience, 2 residents (with a history of involvement and likely appointed by the Governor) and 2 members from DHCD and ANF. | Build out of this system will require an estimated at \$8.5 to \$12 million increase over existing funds to pay for central and regional supervision and TA and centralized back office functions.            | Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Governance of operations becomes highly skilled and more accountable</li><li>• Local governance focused on high priority issues of ownership &amp; development</li></ul>                         | Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Governance of new management system could be complicated</li></ul>   |
|   |   |   |   | Government Oversight <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Focuses oversight to regulatory compliance, fiscal compliance &amp; performance evaluation</li><li>• Reduces administrative infrastructure (fewer entities to monitor)</li></ul>       | Government Oversight  |
| <b>Central Service Group. All LHAs with fewer than 200 units will have mandatory participation. All other LHAs will be voluntary.</b> | Form a single, consolidated housing authority property management system consisting of local site staff, regional supervision and technical assistance and centralized back-office functions. Participation in the system would be mandatory for all LHAs with fewer than 200 units and optional for all other housing authorities.   | Maintain local boards to function in an ownership and development capacity and link local boards to the governance of the operating system.   | Work out future operating funds based on separate budgets back to LHAs.   | Operations <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Invests in highly trained central and regional staff</li><li>• Improves local services by local staff on site-based activities and expanding access to professional supports</li></ul>           | Operations <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More complicated and costly transition due to current staff contracts that must be transitioned.</li><li>• Some local administration functions &amp; staff (e.g., bookkeeping) shift to central office</li></ul>           |
|   |   | From a single governance structure to oversee the property management system that is accountable to Governor, legislature, housing authorities and residents.   | Build out of this system will require an estimated at \$8.5 to \$12 million increase over existing funds to pay for central and regional supervision and TA and centralized back office functions.            | Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Governance of operations becomes highly skilled and more accountable</li><li>• Local governance focused on high priority issues of ownership &amp; development</li></ul>                         | Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Local boards must have ability to control the central services group if systems fail.</li></ul>  |
|   |   | The board will consist of 13 members 9 of which LHA members are elected regionally by LHAs, three residents elected by Mass Union and one governor appointee.   |   |   | Stipulations <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Same number of jobs resulting in no job loss.</li><li>• Additional hiring should follow Section 3 of federal government</li></ul>  |